



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, XXXII (1908, 1 and 2).

Pp. 5-23. Louis Havet, Notes on Plautus (Continuation. See A. J. P. XXX, pp. 465-473). Epid. 9; 15; 24 and 26; 29 and 31, 44, 57, 65; 47, 48 and 50; 61; 67-68; 75-76, 177; 90; 126; 130-131; 136; 140; 204; 279; 361; 364-365; 477; 531; 585-586; 624; 625; 668; 679 (and Trin. 979); 714.

Pp. 24-25. Georges Nicole, Note on the Parabasis of the Knights. Nicole defends the reading *στρώματα* (Eq. 605) against the reading *βρώματα* advocated by Paul Girard and supported by the Ravennas.

Pp. 26-28. D. Serruys, Notes on a comparatively unknown Manuscript of Plutarch's Lives. The manuscript in question, the existence of which seems to have been unknown to Konrat Ziegler, *Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der vergleichenden Lebensbeschreibungen Plutarchs*, Leipzig, 1907, is a carefully written 11th century Athos parchment manuscript, which, in the catalogue of Chrysostomos, bears the number 324. It comprises 128 leaves, about half of which are more or less mutilated as the result of moisture. There are indications that our manuscript, which contains only ten of the Lives, originally formed part of a larger codex, which embraced all of the Lives. In the course of a recent visit to Athos undertaken for some other scientific purpose, Serruys had an opportunity to inspect MS No. 324, and as a result of a rather rapid survey of the Lives of Alexander and Caesar, he has reached the conclusion that our MS is the best representative of the class of Plutarch MSS to which the V<sup>b</sup> and the M of Sintenis belong, and he expresses the hope that at some early date one of the younger monks may undertake the task of collating it.

Pp. 28-29. C. E. Ruelle, Proposed Corrections in the Anonymus of Bellermann. On p. 20, the term *προκρουσμός* with its proper notation, and on p. 25, the definition of *προκρουσμός*, are omitted, whilst at the same places the notation (*re-mi-re, mi-fa-mi*), and the definition of *ἐκκρουσμός* (*ἐκκρουσμός δὲ ἐστὶν ὅταν τοῦ αὐτοῦ φθόγγου δις λαμβανομένου, μέσος παραλαμβάνηται ὁ ξύτερος φθόγγος*), are those that properly belong to *προκρουσμός*. Ruelle proposes to make the proper additions and corrections.

Pp. 30-35. Salomon Reinach, *Divina Philippica*. The source of the remarkable eulogy of Pompey at the opening of the

seventh book of Lucan's *Pharsalia* must be sought in Cicero's Second Philippic. Verses 40-44, in particular, which are somewhat obscure when taken by themselves, become perfectly clear when viewed in the light of the 26th section of the Second Philippic. To this view it might possibly be objected that as Lucan seems to have followed Livy in his historical narrative, it may have been Livy and not Cicero, from whom he caught his enthusiasm for Pompey. But Livy was too sane an historian to have indulged in such extravagances of expression as did Lucan. Furthermore, Cicero's Second Philippic had become a classic almost from the day of its publication, and it influenced Livy as it influenced Juvenal and others. Lastly, the parallelism of language in Lucan and in the Second Philippic, especially in the passages above cited, is so striking that it is impossible to believe that the sentiments in question are derived from any other source than Cicero.

Pp. 36-46. E. Cavaignac, *The Changes in the Rating of the Solonian Property Classes*. Boeckh inferred from [Dem.] 43, 54 that the rating of the *zeugites* was based upon a minimum income of 150 measures. This figure does not agree with that given by Aristotle and by Pollux, who assign a minimum income of 200 measures to that class. Cavaignac explains this apparent contradiction by the hypothesis that the number 150 represented the rating of the *zeugites* till the adoption in about 590 B. C. of the Euboico-Attic instead of the Aeginetan standard of weights and measures, and that the number 200 is simply due to the evaluation of the old schedule in terms of the new. Accepting 500, 300, and 150 as the original figures for the minimum incomes of the *pentacosimedimni*, the knights, and the *zeugites* respectively, these figures would, under the new standard, become 666. 66, 400, and 200. The reason why Aristotle, *Pol.* 7, records the change in the rating of only the *zeugite* class, is stated to be that in the latter half of the fifth century, the date of most of the Aristotelian sources, accurate information with regard to the rating of the first two classes was not available. Cavaignac further believes that by about 480 B. C. another increase in the rating of the upper two classes had taken place. Pollux (8, 130) makes the statement that the *pentacosimedimni*, with an income of 500 dr., paid one talent into the public treasury, the knights, with an income of 300 dr., half a talent, the *zeugites*, with an income of 200 dr., ten minae, and the *thetes* nothing. On the basis of this information Boeckh evolved his brilliant theory of a graduated capitalization of incomes for purposes of assessment. He maintained that, to ascertain the amount of the taxable capital in any given case, the annual income was first multiplied by 12, and then, if the owner of the property belonged to the highest class, he was assessed for the entire amount of the sum so obtained; if he belonged to the second class, he was assessed for five-sixths of that amount; and, if he belonged to the third

class, he was taxed on only five-ninths of his estate. But Cavaignac accepts neither this nor any other theory of graduated capitalization. He believes that Pollux confused two different schedules, an earlier one based on incomes, and a later one based on capitalization. At 18%, which Cavaignac considers to have been the prevailing rate of interest at Athens at the period in question, Pollux's ten minae would in round numbers represent the capitalization of 200 dr., his half talent would in like manner correspond to an income of 600 dr., and his talent would correspond to an income of 1200 dr. There would thus be shown a rise in the rating of the upper two classes without a corresponding increase in the assessment of the third class. As the causes of this change, Cavaignac ventures to assign the depreciation of the purchasing power of silver and the institution of the liturgies, and he thinks that, in consequence of the continued operation of these causes, there were still further changes, so much so that there is every reason to believe that the ratings of 6000, 3000, and 1000 dr. of the schedule of 480 B. C. were in 427 represented by a capital of 20000, 10000, and 3333.33 dr. respectively. Notwithstanding all these changes, the traditional names of *pentacosiomedimni*, knights, *zeugites*, and *thetes* had been maintained during all this time, but successive *εισφοραι*, beginning in 428/7, gradually broke down this classification, and, as a result of the general reassessment in 378/7, the Solonian property classes, which had so long survived the economic conditions that had called them into being, definitively ceased to exist.

Pp. 47-58. Félix Gaffiot, *The Alleged Use of Si Interrogative in Latin*. Grammarians have been in the habit of recording a so-called use of interrogative *si* and in support of this use have been adducing passages from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and Livy. In 1904 Gaffiot published a dissertation in which he claimed that, aside from three *quasi*-examples in Livy, there was but one genuine example of interrogative *si* in all Latin literature. This example occurs in Propertius and is pronounced a Hellenism by the author, whilst the three apparent examples in Livy are regarded as bold extensions of the construction *scrutari si*. Many scholars have accepted Gaffiot's conclusions, but there are some grammarians who, though admitting that the list of examples of interrogative *si* must be considerably curtailed, yet believe that there is a certain residue of passages in which *si* can justly lay claim to an interrogative force. Unfortunately for their contention, these grammarians do not agree among themselves, and it is this lack of agreement that has led Gaffiot to treat the question once more in these pages. The author concludes his discussion with the following words: "We French, since the days of Riemann and thanks to his instruction, have learned to admit the conditional force of *si* after *expectare*, *conari*, etc. According to my opinion, one

should go still further and admit this force everywhere; in other words, I am of the opinion that there is no interrogative *si* in Latin."

Pp. 59-63. Félix Gaffiot, The Error of the Subjunctive of Repetition—An Addition to Causal *Cum*. The doctrine that in iterative sentences with *cum* the subjunctive after *cum* is abnormal and is used to emphasize the idea of iteration, is rejected as false by Gaffiot. In conformity with the general law formulated by him in his treatise entitled *Le Subjonctif de subordination en latin* (Paris, Klincksieck, 1906), the author claims that in these *cum* clauses the use of the subjunctive is optional, the indicative being used when *cum* expresses a temporal relation pure and simple, the subjunctive, when *cum* has a causal connotation. The operation of this principle is exemplified by a number of subjunctive examples, which are discussed in detail.

P. 63. René Pichon, Critical Note on Tacitus. In *Dial.*, 16, read *iam* for the MS *fama*.

Pp. 64-65. René Pichon, Virgil's Judgment of Horace. Bayard had proposed a new interpretation of Horace Sat. I, x, 44, according to which *molle* and *facetum* are not substantives but adjectives, agreeing with *epos*, which here means not epic poetry but hexameter verse. Pichon advances a couple of additional arguments in favor of this interpretation.

Pp. 65-67. René Pichon, Critical Notes on Livy. *Exsuperabiles* 21, 30, 7; *inclinare animos* 22, 58, 7; *stupere* 24, 25, 8; *neque eleuo* 28, 42, 6; *ut tot in Italia populi ad se deficerent* 28, 44, 4; *omnibus* 29, 27, 2.

Pp. 68-72. P. Mazon, Notes on Menander. Critical notes on *Epitrep.* 1-3; 138-140; 145-153; 156-158; 226-228; *Sam.* 15; 55; 68-71; 82-86; 97-105; 136; 159; 160; 176 sqq.; 288 sq.

Pp. 73-76. L. Bodin, Notes on Menander's *Epitrepontes*. The first part of this paper shows that the Auge and the Alope of Euripides, by a sort of *contaminatio*, furnished the starting-point of the *Epitrepontes* and provided Menander with the theme of one of the prettiest scenes of that play. It would thus appear that Menander made use of Euripides in the same manner in which his own works were later used by Terence. The second part of Bodin's paper consists of critical notes on the *Epitrepontes*, the verses considered being 44, 48, 53, 57-58, 85 sqq., 106, 304, 419-423, and 454-458.

Pp. 77-93. Book Notices.

Pp. 95-128. Jean Psichari, Sophocles and Hippocrates apropos of the Philoctetes of Lemnos. Psichari complains that in the study of the history of Greek medicine from Homer to Hippocrates not enough attention has been accorded to Sophocles. Only a few of the most obvious and general facts relating

to this author have been pointed out, whereas the most important and the most specific points have been left unnoticed. It is the purpose of this paper to elucidate several passages of Sophocles' Philoctetes and to emphasize certain points of contact between Sophocles and Hippocrates. The most important passages considered are verses 782-784 :

ἀλλὰ δέδοικ', ὦ παῖ, μή μ' ἀτελὲς εὐχή·  
 στάζει γὰρ αὖ μοι φοίνιον τόδ' ἐκ βυθοῦ  
 κηκίον αἶμα, καί τι προσδοκῶ νέον.

and verses 823-825 :

ιδρώς γέ τοι νιν πᾶν καταστάζει δέμας,  
 μέλαινά τ' ἄκρου τις παρέρρωγεν ποδὸς  
 αἱμορραγῆς φλέψ.

The commentators do not seem to have noticed the special medical significance of the words *στάζειν* and *αἱμορραγεῖν*. Psichari adduces a number of passages from Hippocrates and the Hippocratic corpus to show that these two words are sharply differentiated, *στάζειν* being used only of the slow issuance of blood by drops, and *αἱμορραγεῖν* being the term applied to profuse bleeding. The author further shows that according to Hippocratic theory a slight bleeding of the nose in certain diseases was regarded as a very unfavorable symptom, whereas profuse bleeding was looked upon as a sure token of a speedy recovery. (Cf., e. g., Epid. I, 9, Littr. II, 652-4: οὐδ' ἡμορράγησεν ἐκ ῥινῶν οὐδενί, . . . . ἀλλὰ σμικρὰ ἔσταξεν . . . . ἐκταῖοι ἀπέθνησκον.) While it is true that in most of these passages regard is had principally to the bleeding of the nose, yet the term *αἱμορραγεῖν* is used also in the case of a *ῥίλος*, which is precisely the expression that Philoctetes applies to his own wound (v. 650). It is perfectly natural then that after the use of the word *στάζειν* in verse 784 the patient should be represented at his worst: the exclamations of pain are multiplied, Philoctetes cannot speak without sobbing, and the agony becomes so great that he even invokes death; but when the hemorrhage ensues, as indicated by the words *πατέρρωγεν . . . αἱμορραγῆς φλέψ*, there is a general amelioration and the patient goes to sleep.

But the foregoing are not the only points of contact between Sophocles and Hippocrates. The perspiration that covers Philoctetes' body at the moment of sinking (823), and the exhortation to leave the patient undisturbed so that he may fall off into a sleep (825 sq.), may be paralleled by almost identical language in Hippocrates; and there are three other details, not, to be sure, sufficiently noted by the commentators, that might serve as a practical illustration of a Hippocratean clinic. While the drops of blood are still oozing out of the wound and the evil is still in the stage of aggravation, Philoctetes suffers an impairment of vision, apparently not being able to see Neoptolemus, although the latter is present (805); difficulty of speech sets in (814), and the head sinks back (822). These same three symptoms, *σκοτώ-*

*σιες*, *ἀφωνή*, and *καρηβαρή*, are mentioned in the Hippocratean corpus in a passage describing the consequences of a stoppage of the proper circulation of the blood. Psichari attempts also to illustrate verses 827-831 by the help of medical literature, and though he does not feel so sure of his results in this case, he has presented some valuable observations.

In view of the above it is impossible to deny the points of contact between Sophocles and Hippocrates. The question is whether Hippocrates could have exerted any influence upon Sophocles or not. Dr. Ch. Daremberg, the author of a number of important articles on the subject of Greek medicine, answers this question in the negative. But when one considers that the *Philoctetes* was presented in 409, and that Hippocrates was born in either 460 or 470, and was therefore 51 or 61 years of age at the time of the production of the *Philoctetes*, one cannot deny that at that period of his life Sophocles may have had a close acquaintance with the writings of Hippocrates. A similar influence seems to have been exerted by Hippocrates upon Euripides at the time of the production of the *Orestes*, brought out in 408, for Harries and Nestle have both pointed out correspondences between the *Orestes* and the Hippocratic corpus. But whether Sophocles was acquainted with the writings of Hippocrates or not, it is certain that he was no stranger to medical lore, and it is high time that his claims were recognized, especially since there has been a tendency to underrate Sophocles in this respect in comparison with Euripides.

Pp. 129-136. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *The New Greek Papyri from Elephantine*. The papyri discovered by Rubensohn at Elephantine in 1906, serve to establish the following facts: 1. Ptolemy Soter reckoned the years of his reign from the death of Alexander the Great. 2. His reign officially extended to the forty-first year. 3. When, two years before his death, he associated his son with him, he did not officially abdicate his throne. 4. It was he, not his son, that founded the cult of Alexander. 5. A special eponymous priestly office was instituted by him not later than 289-288 B. C.

Pp. 137-141. C. E. Ruelle, *Palmoscopy*. This article is virtually a notice of "Beitraege zur Zuckungsliteratur des Okzidents und Orients. I. Die griechischen Zuckungsbücher (*Melampus περὶ παλμῶν*). Herausgegeben von H. Diels. Abh. der Kgl. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. vom Jahre 1907, No. 4". In addition to a summary of the results of Diels' investigations, the author gives a French translation of a portion of the text of *Melampus*.

P. 142. C. E. Ruelle, *A Proposed Correction of Aristides Quintilianus περὶ μουσικῆς*, p. 117, l. 17 Mb. In *κὰν τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ τεταρτημορίοις τὰ ὅμοια μεταχειριούμεθα*, read *μορίοις* for *τεταρτημορίοις*.

Pp. 143-147. D. Serruys, Two Lexica Attributed to Theophylactus of Bulgaria. From a study of the contents of the Parisinus MS, suppl. gr., 676, and a comparison of some of the fragments with their sources, the author concludes that about the opening of the tenth century there was compiled a lexicon, whose authorship may, with some degree of probability, be attributed to Arethas, whereas Theophylactus of Bulgaria, who, in the above-mentioned MS, is credited with some of the material found in the conjectural lexicon, was most probably the author of a volume of classical anecdotes and reminiscences, in which were incorporated, among other things, selections, usually in an abridged form, from the aforesaid lexicon.

Pp. 147-148. D. Serruys, Firmicus Maternus, IV, prooem. § 5. Serruys rejects Teuffel's *Mercurius et Hanubius* and Reitzenstein's *Mercurius et Chnubis*, and proposes to read *Mercurius et Hermanubius* for the MS *Mercurius einhnusuix*.

Pp. 149-157. B. Haussoullier and R. Dareste, An Inscription from Amorgos: A Law of Aigiale Relating to a Foundation. Haussoullier republishes the Greek text of an IS from Amorgos, and appends a French translation by R. Dareste. The IS, which constitutes No. 515 of *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Vol. XII, consists of 134 lines, averaging about ten words each, and embodies a law containing detailed regulations regarding the institution of an annual festival upon a foundation of Critolaus, a citizen of the town of Aigiale. The most conspicuous features of this festival were a free public banquet and gymnastic contests.

Pp. 158-160. D. Serruys, *Koipavides*. The name *Kypavides*, which is the title of certain Hermetic writings, published by Ruelle in Vol. II of Mély and Ruelle's *Les Lapidaires de l'Antiquité*, is derived from *κοίπavos*, the constant epithet of the gods of the Hermetic cycle. The *Koipavides* (this would really be the proper spelling) are naught else than "the revelations of the sovereign gods", or, if one choose, "the sovereign revelations".

Pp. 161-174. Reviews and Book Notices.

C. W. E. MILLER.

## HERMES XLII.

### Fascicle 3.

Die Oekonomie der Rede Ciceros für den Dichter Archias (W. Sternkopf). The Pro Archia, always a favorite (Quintilian quotes it nine times), has not been regarded as one of Cicero's great speeches (cf. Tacit. Dial. de or. 37), and even attacks on its genuineness had to be repelled in modern times. There still remain adverse criticisms: Halm considers the legal argument merely a sketch of that actually delivered, Teuffel-Schwabe find



it too declamatory, while Schmalz misses a careful disposition of the subject matter. All these blemishes seem to yield to Sternkopf's careful analysis. The case of Archias was strong (Drumann, IV 203, says 'weak') and Cicero's very brevity is effective; but C.'s real interest lay in espousing the cause of literature and Greek culture, as he does especially in 12-16, which part furnishes a fitting background to set off the merits of the poet. S. shows the logical coherence and careful articulation of the various parts, much of which has been commonly overlooked, and particularly points out the skill with which C. does justice to Lucullus without giving cause for irritation to Pompey and his party. Archias' proposition to glorify Cicero's deeds is discreetly admitted. S. adds some interesting textual and exegetical notes.

Der Anonymus Argentinensis (U. Wilcken). B. Keil published in elaborate form (Trübner, 1902) a Strassburg papyrus containing on the verso, written about 100 A. D., ten paragraphs, mostly introduced by *ἔτι*, in twenty-six fragmentary lines, which seemed to be chronologically arranged extracts from an unknown history of Athens. The appointment of a building commission 457 B. C., and the removal of the Delian treasure to Athens 450 B. C., were among the startling novelties. W. shows that these papyrus notes are brief extracts from an excellent commentary to Demosthenes' speech against Androtion (594, 26-599, 26). On this basis, with the aid of a mirror and powerful magnifying glass, W. has made important corrections in Keil's text. The results are still valuable, but not revolutionary as those of Keil. Most important, according to W., is the corroboration and supplementing of Thucydides II 24, which is due to the use of the same Attic decrees, possibly in Craterus' collection. W. has hastened his publication; further investigation is needed.

Herodotstudien, besonders zur spartanischen Geschichte (B. Niese). N. thinks it possible to detach the oral variations or additions that Herodotus owed to native *λόγιοι*, whom he met on his travels, from the main outline of his history [Bury, *The Anc. Gk. Hist.*, p. 69, and Busolt II<sup>2</sup>, p. 609, n. 3], the Hellenic parts of which he had obtained, also orally for the most part, from Ionic predecessors, who, after the manner of poets and sophists, were professional narrators of history. These variations of Athenians, Aeginetans, etc., show a reaction against the older Hellenic version of the outline (*ὥς δὲ ὁ πολλὸς λόγος Ἑλλήνων* I 75, 10; cf. VI 75, 18; VII 150, 2; 189, 4-5), are conjectural, more recent and less reliable. Accordingly by means of elimination and reasoning N. reconstructs the original story of Dorieus, rehabilitates Lycurgus by expunging the fictitious royal genealogy and adhering to his connection with the subjugation of Tegea, whereby L.'s date falls below 700 B. C., to which period

must be assigned the disk of Iphitus, a reliable monument of Lycurgus' importance in the growth of Spartan power. As a step in this expansion must be regarded the founding of the six Triphylian cities. The part the Alcmaeonidae are said to have played in the expulsion of the tyrants is an Athenian exaggeration, told to lessen the importance of the Spartan assistance. The double banishment and return of Pisistratus is not an historical doublet as Beloch and Meyer think.

Die Ciris und das römische Epyllion (S. Sudhaus). The dependence of the Ciris on Vergil has been proved by Leo (cf. A. J. P. XXX, p. 459); but, while that was a tribute to Vergil's fame soon after 19 B. C., we must look to the cantores Euphorionis for its natural and chief sources. The frequency of voces Graecae, diminutives, spondaic lines, parentheses, caesural rhymes (128 cases), etc., are significant. Not only was Catullus drawn upon more intensely, relatively, than Vergil; but still more important as sources were the Io of Licinius Calvus (passim and especially vv. 142-162), to which Skutsch has attributed certain verses, and particularly the Smyrna of C. Helvius Cinna (cf. Carme with the nurse in Ovid Met. X 362 ff.). The Ciris is a mosaic, in which every other verse shows traces of borrowing, full of contaminations, and combinations of incongruous matter; but, as whole blocks of verses were incorporated, viz., 93-98, 340-348 (cf. 538-541 with Verg. Georg. I 406-409), it is valuable in giving us a better idea of Calvus and Cinna. The style, self-characterized (v. 20) as: *gracilem molli pede claudere versum* is that of the circle of Valerius Cato, and deserves a close comparison with that of Catullus. The "belated neoteric" had a fellow imitator in Valgius Rufus, consul 12 B. C. (cf. Schol. Ver. to Ecl. 7, 22), who helped to verify the prophecy of Catullus 95: *Smyrnam cana diu saecula peruoluent*.

Miscellen.—Otto Seeck reaffirms his view (Rh. M. 56, p. 631) that M. Brutus was born 78 B. C. (Vell. II 72, 1), and that the passage in Cic. Brut. 324 is corrupt, against Groebe (cf. A. J. P. XXX 464). Aur. Vict. de vir. ill. 82, 3 does not prove that Brutus was quaestor 53 B. C. [But cf. Leo's reading *id* for *is*, Hermes 42, p. 314, n. 2; p. 507, n. 1.] Moreover Cicero calls him *princeps iuventutis* 50 B. C. (Ad Fam. III 11, 3), which implies that he had not yet held the quaestorship, as this office removed one from the *iuventus* to the senate. Hence in 50 B. C. he was not yet 31 years old. His praetorship 44 B. C., that is to say in his 34th year, could be due to Caesar's disregard of the *leges annales*. His birth in 78 B. C. would accord with the gossip that Caesar was his father.—C. Robert restores v. 6 of the Hesiod-Meleager fragm. (Berl. Klass. Texte, Heft 5): *τοῦ καὶ ἀπ' ὀφ[θαλμῶν ἀπελάμπετο θεσπιδᾶες πῆρ* (cf. Aspis 72), v. 7 may have read *γοργῶν ὑψηλ* . . ; he also suggests that as the four *ἀραί* of the second Euphorion fragm. (p. 58) agree in their progress from moun-

tain and Skiron's cliff to Tainaron and Hades with the journey of Heracles, they were directed against him by Eurystheus. The happy return of H. is described on the other side of the papyrus.—L. Schmidt believes, with others, that it was Ariovistus, who, according to Mela III 45 and Pliny hist. nat. II 170, made the proconsul of Gaul Q. Caecilius Metellus a present of a lot of people from India, who had been stranded on the coast of Germany. But, while Pliny says rex Sueborum, Mela has rex Botorum (an unknown tribe, hence a crux). S. suggests that Nepos, their common source, had written: rex Tribocorum Sueborum (or Trib. et Sueb.).—U. Wilcken reports the work done on the Sosylus papyrus (cf. A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 469): Ibscher, the conservator of the Berlin museum has skillfully joined the fragments and, among the improvements on W's text, has joined the *ov* of III 1 (cf. Hermes XLI, p. 107) to IV 1, corroborating K. Fuhr's conjecture (Berl. Ph. W. 1906, 154); Seymour de Ricci (Revue Celtique XXVII (1906), p. 129 ff.) has recognized in certain prefixed dots a stichometric division of the lines into groups of ten, which substantiates W's conjecture that only a single column preceded column I. Fr. Rühl (Rh. Mus. LXI (1906), p. 358/9) has offered some good interpretations; but W. rejects his suggestion that the Artemisium where Heraclides employed his naval stratagem was on the Carian coast.

#### Fascicle 4.

Zur griechischen Sagenchronographie (R. Laqueur). The ancient chronographers did not base their computations of mythical dates on the last year of this or that Spartan king (viz. Sosibius on Demaratus, Ephorus on Pausanias, Eratosthenes on Leonidas), as Meyer (Forsch. I 179) thinks; but upon the first Olympiad, which marked the close of the spatium mythicum. The variations were due to the basic year being either 777 or 776; to the number of *γεγεαι* added; to the rounding off of  $33\frac{1}{2}$  now to 33 now to 34; to the *γεγεαι* being estimated throughout at  $33\frac{1}{2}$  (also at 30), or only back to the Ionian migration, from here on the periods of 30 and 40 years being substituted (cf. Thuc. I 12, Strabo XIII 582). Thus the dates for the Fall of Troy can be analysed as follows: The 1209 of the Marmor Par. = 776 (but Ol. 1, 1 is not mentioned) + 433 (i.e.  $13 \times 33\frac{1}{2}$ ); the famous 1184 of Eratosthenes-Apollodorus = 777 + 267 + 60 + 80; the 1171 of Sosibius = 777 + 334 + 60; the 1270 of Pseudo-Herodotus = 776 + 434 + 60; the 1290 of Eretes (Crates?) = 776 + 434 + 80, etc. The simplicity of this method has been obscured by the contamination of different systems. The irregular interval of 127 years between the Fall of Troy and the Ionian migration (Philostratus, Heroic. II 194 Kayser) is the difference between Sosibius' Trojan date 1171 and 1044, Eratosthenes' date for the latter. The addition of 80, /7 and 60 respectively to 1069, Ephorus' date for the Return

of the Heraclidae (Clement. Alex. Strom. I 139), reveals the origin of the Trojan eras 1149, 1135 and 1129, from which in turn were evolved by a change of interval, the new Heraclidian eras 1089 (Diod. XVI 76, 5), 1075, and 1049 (Phainias in Clement. Alex. l. c.). The interval between 1075 and Ol. 1, 1 harmonizes with the lists of the Spartan Agiads, and the Corinthian kings, both of which lack 30/1 years of attaining to the Eratosth.—Apollod. interval of 328 years (Diod. 1, 5, 1), which solves a perplexing problem. These and other details are given with an excursus on the chronology of Pythagoras. Only two Trojan dates do not conform to the formula Ol. 1, 1 + n generations; the round numbers in Herodotus (II 145) and Duris (Clem. Alex. Strom. I 139).

Eine neue Schrift des Alexander von Tralles (M. Wellmann). The Escorial library in Spain contains a parchment MS of the XI century: codex Scorialensis gr. R. III 3 (E) in which from fol. 141<sup>v</sup> on is a list of medical prescriptions for wounds, etc., which must have been taken by some physician from books 13, 14, 15 of the Tetrabiblon of Aetius in reverse order. E was revised in the XIV century with the aid of a MS that bore the name Alexander according to two marginal notes; undoubtedly the famous Alex. of Tralles who himself stated that he had borrowed from Aetius (I 437 ed. Puschmann). This discovery throws light on the literary activity of this overrated physician, and is valuable for the textual criticism of Aetius. W. adds a note from another MS (cod. Scorial. gr. α I 8), which corroborates Puschmann's conjecture that Alexander was a Christian.

Methana und Hypata (W. Dittenberger(†)) Stahl-Hude read in Thucydides IV 45, 2 and V 18, 7 *Μέθανα*, following Strabo VIII 6, 15, p. 374, who says however: *παρὰ Θουκυδίδη δὲ ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις Μεθώνη* (so all extant Thuc. MSS). It should be (*ἀ*) *Μεθάνα* according to the epichoric inscriptions. The feminine is demanded by the apposition *τὴν μεταξὺ* in Thuc. IV 45, 2. The accent in Strabo is of no consequence. The neuter plural form in Pausanias II 34, 2. 3. 4 must be his mistake (cf. his *Ἀλική* for *Ἀλικίς*, Hermes 42, 3/4). Hence Thucydides wrote here, as was his custom, the local form, which was gradually crowded out by *Μεθώνη*, the form in common use, as in many other instances (cf. Niese Hermes XIV 1879, p. 423 ff.). Similarly *Ῥπατα* occurs in Lucian Lucius 5. Asinus 1 (the only certain instance of the neut. pl.). Here there is abundant proof, inscriptional and literary, that *ἀ Ῥπάτα* was the only correct form.

Zwei Identificationen (B. Keil). I Aquila: The Neoplatonist Syrian (V century A. D.) in his work on *στάσεις*, after introductory matter from Hermogenes, turns to more recent authorities, the philosophers Euagoras and Aquila, *τοὺς τὴν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ἐπιστήμην τῇ ῥητόρῳι συμμίκαντας τέχνη* (a vindication of Isocrates' doctrine). While Syrian mentions the two together a number of

times, he cites Aquila alone for details, who furthermore, alone of the two, is mentioned by Syrian's contemporaries, Nilus and Georgios Monos in their commentaries on Hermogenes. This shows that Syrian had the *τέχνη* of Aquila, from which he obtained his knowledge of Euagoras. While both belonged to a former generation (cf. 128, 23 *μέχρι τῶν Εὐαγόρου καὶ Ἀκύλου χρόνων*), Euagoras is the earlier, and once is considered alone (II 3, 23 *ἐπὶ τῶν Εὐαγόρου τοῦ φιλοσόφου χρόνων*), where he is credited with the statement that there was at Athens a *σοφιστής* who persisted in harping on the proverb: *τὸ λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ λαλεῖν*. This was the maxim of a certain Phrynichus (cf. Rh. Gr. V. 610, 15 ff. W.), whom Himerius (or. 24) also had heard in Athens in his youth. Keil shows that Himerius lived 300–380 A. D. (the usual dates are 315–385); hence Phrynichus, and consequently Euagoras, must be placed early in the IV century, and Aquila a generation later. Both were Neoplatonists, and Aquila must be identical with the commentator mentioned by Syrian's pupil Proclus (in Tim. 319 E), as well as with the *Ἀκύλας* in Suidas. II Mesomedes: K. sees in Pseudo-Lucian *Ἐγκώμιον Δημοσθένους* 27: *ΟΠΛΑΑΝ ΑΛΙΟΔΗΜΟΥ τοῦ ΤΡΟΙΖΗΝΙΟΥ* a majusculan corruption and reads: *ὁ παῖδαν* (conj. Bergk) *Μεσομήδων* [should be *Μεσομήδους* according to Suidas] *τοῦ Ῥιζηνίου* (Crete), which adds a paean to Asclepius to the works of Hadrian's freedman, the well-known lyric poet, and designates his native town.

Selbstcitate in den Biographien Plutarchs (J. Mewaldt). Plutarch like Galen, was fond of citing his own works (cf. *Moralia*); but the cross references in the biographies have been mostly discredited, on the tacit assumption that each pair of lives was published separately (cf. Michaelis, dissert. de ordine vit. paral. Plut. Berl. 1875). The difficulty vanishes when we assume that the lives were composed and edited in groups, determined mainly by their common sources. Thus we find united by these very cross references the following: Dio-Brutus, Timoleon-Aemilius Paulus, Alexander-Caesar, Agesilaus-Pompeius; the first pair of which alone is numbered (i. e. XII). and the Dio alone is addressed to his friend Sosius Senecio, which address makes the *σοι* in Timoleon I 23 intelligible. A second group is: Theseus-Romulus, Lycurgus-Numa, Themistocles-Camillus. Here again Sosius Senecio is addressed but once (i. e. Thes. I, 1). A third group would include at least: Coriolanus-Alcibiades, and Nicias-Crassus. M. gives a tentative order of all the biographies with a complete list of citations as proof. Some of the citations are too closely interwoven with their context to allow elimination; others tell what Plut. alone could know, as the projected life of Metellus (cf. Marius 29, 50). The rich variety in form argues against the theory of marginal notes.

Die Überlieferung des interpolierten Textes von Senecas Tragödien II (Th. Düring). The interpolated edition (cf. A. J. P.

XXX 460) originated in the IV century from the pure text represented by E (cf. Richter Krit. Unters. zu Senec. Trag. Jena 1899, p. 6 ff.); but A, the archetype of the more than eighty MSS, belonged to the XIII century. D. traces to this a number of errors, some of which, as well as the lacunae, were due to the defective source of A, some to the misreading of abbreviations, some existed in the source itself as ancient excerpts prove. Toward the close of the XIII century, when interest in Sen. trag. awoke, only A and E and copies of them existed. Lovato de Lovati, born circa 1240, owned a copy of A, and drew the attention of Albertino Mussato, the father of the Renaissance tragedy to Seneca. A little later Nic. Treveth, with a poor copy of A wrote his commentary in response to an (extant) letter from cardinal Niccolo Albertini di Prato (cf. Peiper De Sen. trag. lect. vulg., p. 36). To the authority of this commentary was due the multiplication of the A class, as well as many superficial conjectures. It is strange that there are no direct copies of E extant; only M and N derive from such a one (Σ), now lost. But the influence of E, directly and indirectly, on the A class was very great, though held in check by the authority of the commentary. The value of the commentary (complete in Vatic. 1650), the oldest tradition of A, is lessened by conjectures of Treveth, that of Laurent. 37, 6 (1368 A. D.), the oldest representative, through contamination with E; hence the best representatives are Laurent. 24 sin. 4 (1371 A. D.) and Neapol. IV D 47 (1376 A. D.).

Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Marc Aurel (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). A valuable critical and exegetical commentary on thirty passages from I 16 to XII 31, calling attention to proposed emendations from Gataker to Stich, viz.: I 16 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 6, 25; 7, 1 f.) ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ προαπέστη κτλ. is unnecessarily changed by Stich to οὔτοι προαπέστη. It is an abbreviation of ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ λεγόμενον ὅτι προαπέστη. Both the long and short form of citation occur in V 8 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 51, 4 f.); III 5 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 24, 17 ff.), ἐν δὲ τὸ φαιδρὸν κτλ. = ἐνεσσι δὲ κτλ. (cf. Rh. Mus. 1907, p. 320 f.); V 1 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 47, 10 f.), πρὸς τὸ ᾗδεσθαι οὖν γέγονας; ὅλως δὲ σὺ (MSS οὐ) πρὸς πείσιν ἢ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν; in Marcus πείσις is regularly the verbal substantive of πάσχω, and introduced by ὅλως, expresses the general idea in contrast with the special ᾗδεσθαι. This passage has been commonly misunderstood; even Wilamowitz alters it (Gr. Leseb. II, p. 315). X 34 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 140 f.), τῷ δεδηγμένῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀληθῶν δογμάτων shows that Marcus knew his Plato (cf. Symp. 218a). Gataker proposed δεδιδαγμένῳ, Schultz and Stich τεθηγμένῳ. X 17 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 149, 21) αὐτοὺς changed to ἀνθρώπους (Morus, Stich); but the personal pronoun often refers to people in Marcus. XII 3 (Stich<sup>2</sup>, p. 157, 21) ὁ εἰς = quodsi. The Latinisms in Marcus deserve investigation, viz., omission of the article, dative of reference, πῶς = quam (cf. πῶς ὡμὸν ἐστί), μία καὶ ἡτισοῦν ἐνέργεια = unaquaqueque virtus (XII 23), etc.

Nachprüfung der Berliner Reste der Hesiodischen Kataloge (W. Crönert). We have here the results of a renewed examination of the fragments of the Meleager and of Helen's Suitors made at the request of Schubart. Further examination is recommended. Several conjectures are disproved; but the ἀποφθίμειο in line 6 and the note to line 7 of the Meleag. fgm̃t. do not seem to invalidate Robert's suggestions in the Miscellen above.

Xenokrates aus Aphrodisias (M. Wellmann). Some conception of the extensive medical literature subsequent to the Hippocratean corpus is supplied by Celsus, Galen and the elder Pliny. Books XXVIII–XXX of the latter's nat. hist. are filled with remedies obtained from animals (exclusive of fishes), and is one of the most important sources for our knowledge of ancient superstition. That Pliny's source was a Greek physician is shown by parallels from Ps. Democritus, Serapion and Archigenes. Further the array of spurious, obscure and late sponsors, even women, for the superstitions and magic remedies, suggest an encyclopaedic work of a younger contemporary. All this points to the physician Xenocrates of Aphrodisias, who wrote about 70 A. D. *περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τῶν ζῴων ὠφελείας* (Galen XII 248, 250, 252, 261). His remedies from the human body are denounced by Galen, who, further, characterizes him as *ἀνθρώπος τὰλλα περίεργος ἱκανῶς καὶ γοητείας οὐκ ἀπηλλαγμένος*. Pliny likewise condemns, while citing, such remedies. His is the only available name in the index to these books, and the four definitely known extracts from his magic pharmacology in Galen and Alexander of Tralles all appear in nat. hist. Books XXVIII and XXX; besides, the matter from the Theban midwife Olympeia is clearly from him. These and other considerations establish the identification of this source, though Sextius Niger, an opponent of magic remedies, was also drawn upon. Wellmann enumerates five of his works besides ascribing to him a work on gems quoted in Pliny XXXVII 37, which Oehmichen attributed to the Xen. Ephesius mentioned in Pliny XXXVII 25 and in the index to XII, 13 (cf. A. J. P. X, p. 109).

Zu Xenophons Oikonomikos (Th. Thalheim). In twelve of the eighteen passages (I 10–XX 20) discussed, remedies are sought through emendation; in the rest some hundred lines of interpolations are assumed with more or less positiveness. The interpolator seems to have been prone to introduce his additions with the conjunction of the original text, before which the insertion is made; thus the rare *ἀτάρ* (XVII 14) seems to have been mechanically adopted from *Ἀτὰρ οὖν* (XVIII 1). Th. (p. 639) approves Lincke's large excision of III 1–VI 11; but instead of athetizing, with Lincke XIV 4–7, and XV 4–9, he would eliminate continuously XIV 1–XV 1–4. Neither do the rest of his supposed interpolations coincide with those of Lincke (cf. A. J. P. I, p. 169 ff.; also K. Joel Der echte u. d. Xen. Socr. I<sup>1</sup>, p. 30 f.).

Miscellen: J. Stroux finds two glosses in Photius, p. 147, 25f. (Reitzenstein); I. The passive 'Ἀντιδικουμένον καὶ ἀντιδικούμενον in Lysias *περὶ Δι<και>ογένους κλήρου πρὸς Γλαύκωνα*, II. *ἀντιδικούμεν' Θουγενίδης Δικασταῖς* (cf. Photius et Suidas sub. v. *τριαχθῆναι*) with the verse: *τί ὡγάθ' ἀντιδικούμεν ἀλλήλοις ἔτι* (the dative suggested by Wilamowitz in *Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1907, p. 13).—P. Stengel reasserts his explanation of *βοῦς ἔβδομος* (cf. *A. J. P.* XXV, p. 471) against Roscher, even though N. G. Politis and Wilhelm have pointed out that *πετεινός* meant cock in Byzantine and modern Greek, for *πετεινός* in Diogenian. III 50, p. 224 must have displaced *βοῦς* in the original text (cf. Suidas *βοῦς ἔβδομος* and *θύσον*).—Sudhaus strengthens his identification of Metrodorus' *Περὶ πλούτου* in Philodemus' tract *Περὶ κακιῶν κ. τ. λ.* (cf. *A. J. P.* XXVIII, p. 468) by means of conjectures based chiefly on better readings furnished by Chr. Jensen in Kiel, who has now published the whole document.—K. Praechter in support of Diels' explanation of *μόρυχος* as equivalent to *σκοτεινός* cites Hermeias, p. 18, 12 ff. (Couvreur) to Plato *Phaedr.* 227 B, where meaning is extracted from the three names *Ἐπικράτης*, *Μόρυχος* and *Φαῖδρος*: *ὥς κρατουμένου τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐνύλου ὑπὸ τοῦ λαμπροῦ τοῦ Φαίδρου*.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.